



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/843,036	04/25/2001	Matthew Frank Trapani	00-625-B	7211

7590 06/09/2005

George I. Lee
McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff
32nd Floor
300 S. Wacker Drive
Chicago, IL 60606

EXAMINER

TRAN, QUOC A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 06/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/843,036

Applicant(s)

TRAPANI ET AL.

Examiner

Quoc A. Tran

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 March 2005.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/26/04, 1/2/02.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to Amendment A, filed 03/22/2005.
2. Claims 1-40 are currently pending in this application. Applicant amended independent claims 1, 16, 20, 23, 27, 31, 39 and dependent claims 24-26, 29-30, 32-33, 35, 37-38 and 40. Claims 1, 16, 20, 23, 27, 31 and 39 are independent claims.

Response to Argument

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-40 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Independent claims 1, 16, 20, 23, 27, 31 and 39** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Chen et al. US Patent No. 6,507,856 B1 - filed 01/05/1999 (hereinafter Chen), in view of Kanevsky US Patent No. 6,300,947 B1- filed 07/06/1998 (hereinafter Kanevsky), further in view of Bickmore et al. US006857102B1-filed- 01/29/1999 (hereinafter Bickmore).

In regard to independent claim 23, matching and applying a template to the information content (as taught by Chen at col. 1, line 40 through col. 2, line 22, disclosed a business system for parsing the receiving message from data characteristics of information entered into the template, and a second parser for receiving information about data characteristics to provide a return template; the information entered into the template is preferably associated with tag names and the means for merging includes a name tag map for correlating tag names of the template with tag names of the return template), **and if unsuccessful** (as taught at col. 7, lines 35-45 see Fig. 11B through 11E, Chen disclosed a recursive function call of the visit_node() algorithm for each descendent and reinitialize ATAG to NULL when the last descendent is reached, which is used here in the broadest reasonable interpretation as claimed).

Chen does not explicitly teach, **determining if the information content contains normalization markup, and if so: utilizing normalization markup in the information content to normalize the information content**, however (as taught by Kanevsky at col. 8, lines 15-35, it is to be understood that CGI refers to Common Gateway Interface (CGI) scripts which, as is known, are programs written in a script language which function as the glue or interface between HTML (Hypertext Markup Language---the document format used on the World Wide Web) pages and other programs, e.g., database programs. The phrases URL and URL/CGI are generally used interchangeably throughout this description; The interpreter module 202 then provides to determine whether objects (icons, pictures, texts, links, etc.) included in the web page data will fit the particular size of a user's display). Examiner reads: objects (icons, pictures, texts, links, etc.) included in the web page data will fit the particular

size of a user's display), which is used here in the broadest reasonable interpretation as claimed).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the teaching of Chen, wherein a business system for exchanging and merging messages over a network includes a server accessible by a plurality of remote browsers for transmitting a template including fields for information entry and a business system accessible by the server for generating a return document pursuant to information entered in the template on the browsers, to include a means of normalization markup in the information content to normalize the information content of Kanevsky. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification for dynamically display information content (a text or language) regular and consistent, especially with respect to spelling or style from any type of devices and associated screen provided by users (as taught by Kanevsky at col. 2, lines 20-55).

Chen and Kanevsky do not explicitly teach, **wherein the template defines modifications to the document in order to adapt the document for display on a device other than an originally intended device**, however (as taught by Bickmore at col. 3, lines 50-60, Bickmore disclosed a document re-authoring system for device independent access and re-authoring the document without loss of information).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the teaching of Chen and Kanevsky, wherein a business system for utilizing normalization markup in the information content to normalize the information content, to include a means of re-authoring the document without loss of

information in order to adapt the document for display on a device other than an originally intended device taught by Bickmore. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification for dynamically display information content (a text or language) regular and consistent, especially with respect to spelling or style from any type of devices and associated screen provided by users (as taught by Kanevsky at col. 2, lines 20-55).

In regard to independent claim 1, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 23 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to independent claim 16, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 23 above, and in further view of the following, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale, **an automatic normalizer for applying pattern recognition and weighting heuristics on the document tree to produce a normalized document tree**, however (as taught by Bickmore at col. 11, lines 1-67, The document re-authoring systems and methods of this invention then apply a series of transformations to the parse tree, mapping and comparing each resulting transformed parse tree back into a document representation, which may be in a document format that is different from the input format of the original document for 'good enough' to display on independent device. The schema disclosed here in the broadest reasonable interpretation as claimed).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the teaching of Chen and Kanevsky, wherein a business system for utilizing normalization markup in the information content to normalize the information content, to include a means of re-authoring the document without loss of information in order to adapt the document for display on a device other than an originally

intended device taught by Bickmore. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification for dynamically display information content (a text or language) regular and consistent, especially with respect to spelling or style from any type of devices and associated screen provided by users (as taught by Kanevsky at col. 2, lines 20-55).

In regard to independent claims 20, 27 and 39, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 23 and 16 above, and are similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to independent claim 31, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 23 and 16 above, and in further view of the following, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale, **receiving data** (as taught by Chen at col.1, lines 40-45), **and storing information relating to the data into plurality of arrays**, (as taught by Chen at col. 6, lines 5-20).

6. **Dependent claims 2-15, 17-19, 21-22, 24-26, 28-30, 32-38 and 40** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Chen et al. US Patent No. 6,507,856 B1 - filed 01/05/1999 (hereinafter Chen), in view of Kanevsky US Patent No. 6,300,947 B1- filed 07/06/1998 (hereinafter Kanevsky), further in view of Bickmore et al. US006857102B1-filed-01/29/1999 (hereinafter Bickmore).

In regard to dependent claims 2-7, 13-15, 17, 19, 32 and 37-38 incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 23 and 16 above, and further view of the following, and are similarly rejected along the same rationale, **document object tree and meta tags** (as taught by Chen at col. 2, lines 30-52, disclosed first XML (i.e. meta-tags language)

document and its DTD, and generate a DOM (i.e. document object model) tree or a serialized name/value pair array).

In regard to dependent claims 8-11, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 23 above, and are similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claims 12 and 18, is directed to systems for performing the method of claims 23 and 16 above, and further in view of the following, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale, **display by a Pc-based browser that utilizes hypertext markup language (HTML)**

(as taught by Chen at col. 6, lines 10-15, disclosed a client side application, which may serialize tree elements into an array of hypertext markup language (HTML), or a server side stand-alone application).

In regard to dependent claims 21-22 and 24-29, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 23 and 16 above, and are similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 30, is directed to systems for performing the method of claims 23 and 16 above, and further in view of the following, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale, **adding nodes, removing nodes, partitioning nodes into folders** (as taught by Bickmore at col. 6, lines 30-50, disclosed an automatic document re-authoring techniques, which can be categorized along two dimensions: syntactic vs. semantic techniques and transformation vs. elision techniques, which used here in the broadest reasonable interpretation as claimed)..

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the teaching of Chen and Kanevsky, wherein a business

system for utilizing normalization markup in the information content to normalize the information content, to include a means of conditioning a node for re-authoring the document without loss of information in order to adapt the document for display on a device other than an originally intended device taught by Bickmore. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification for dynamically display information content (a text or language) regular and consistent, especially with respect to spelling or style from any type of devices and associated screen provided by users (as taught by Kanevsky at col. 2, lines 20-55).

In regard to dependent claim 33, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 31 above, and in further view of the following, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale, **adding an array to plurality of array as the received data grows in size** (as taught by Chen at col. 6, lines 5-15, as illustrating in Fig. 7, disclose a dynamic XML document exchange system, wherein a standard XML parser takes the input XML and DTD, and generates an intermediate structure, a tree or an array, which serves as part of the input data to a merge algorithm which used here in the broadest reasonable interpretation as claimed).

In regard to dependent claim 34, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 31 above, and in further view of the following, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale, **wherein the plurality of arrays are used to hold values that represent properties of a node of the document object tree** (as taught by Chen at col. 2, lines 43-50, storage device, the step of providing an input document may include the step of providing an input document on a template having data field therein for data entered, the data fields being labeled with name tags to identify the data. The step of compiling may include the step of

parsing the input document into nametag and value pairs in one of a node tree format and an array format).

In regard to dependent claim 35, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 31 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 36, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 31 and 34 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 40, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 23, 16, and 30-31 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

Conclusion

7. ***THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.*** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action

Art Unit: 2176

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quoc A. Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272- 4103. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30AM to 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H. Feild can be reached on (571) 272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Quoc A. Tran

Patent Examiner

Technology Center 2176

May 24, 2005



**SANJIV SHAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER**